

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 CROMAN CORPORATION, an Oregon) 2:05-cv-0575-GEB-JFM
2 corporation,)
3)
4 Plaintiff,) ORDER
5)
6 v.)
7)
8 GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, a New)
9 York corporation; SIKORSKY AIRCRAFT))
10 CORPORATION, a Delaware)
11 corporation; HELICOPTER)
12 SUPPORT, INC., a Connecticut)
13 corporation; UNITED TECHNOLOGIES)
14 CORPORATION, a Delaware)
15 corporation; and ROTAIR)
16 INDUSTRIES, INC., a Connecticut)
17 corporation,)
18)
19 Defendants.)
20 _____)

21 On March 10, 2006, Defendants Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation,
22 Helicopter Support, Inc., and United Technologies Corporation filed an
23 Ex Parte Application to Continue Expert Disclosure, Rebuttal Expert
24 Disclosure, and Discovery Deadline ("Application"). Attached to the
25 Application was a Joint Stipulation to Continue Expert Disclosure and
26 Rebuttal Dates and Discovery Deadline.

27 Since the parties stipulate to modification of the
28 February 1, 2005, Scheduling Order and since modifications can be made

1 in a manner that will not adversely affect the Court's docket, the
2 requested modifications will be made without reaching the issue of
3 good cause. Therefore, the Rule 16 Scheduling Order is modified as
4 follows:

- 5 (1) Experts shall be disclosed on or before May 16, 2006;
- 6 (2) Rebuttal experts shall be disclosed on or before
7 June 16, 2006; and
- 8 (3) All discovery shall be completed on or before
9 September 18, 2006.¹

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: March 15, 2006

12 /s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
13 GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
14 United States District Judge

27 ¹ The parties proposed September 16, 2006, as the
28 discovery deadline. Since September 16, 2006, is a Saturday, a
date different than, but consistent with, the parties' proposal
has been adopted.